The Chicago Tribune.

VOL. 31. CHICAGO, MONDAY, AUGUST 1, 1870. NO. 31.

FOREIGN.

The War in Europe.

The French Repulse at Saarbruck.

Rumored Fighting in the Vicinity of Forbach.

Accounts of Several Small Fights.

Bismarck's Expose of the Secret Negotiations Between France and Prussia.

The Conditions of the Treaty.

Napoleon Says He Never Approved or Accepted the Basis of the Treaty.

The Position of Great Britain as Defined by Gladstone.

Spain, in Strong Language, Demands Explanation from France.

FROM THE FRONT.

BERLIN, THURSDAY, July 28.—The report of a fight at Saarbruck is confirmed. The King and staff left Berlin to-day for the scene.

LONDON, Friday, July 29.—Correspondents arrived this morning from Saarbruck, by Wednesday night, the French and Prussian forces were in sight of each other, and the fight was imminent. The correspondents found the English hostesses had not left from the place from fear of the French, but the British Consul accompanied the family of the Princess. The French at Forbach are 12,000 strong. The numbers of the Prussians are not known, but they have been pouring in for the last few days. The Prussian position is a strong one. Spies have been arrested on both sides. Fighting there, it is believed, will begin to-day. The Prussians have not yet crossed the frontier. The Prussian troops will not cross the frontier. Reports of the fighting are unofficial

The Chicago Tribune.

MONDAY, AUGUST 1, 1870.

POSITION OF THE CONTENDING ARMIES.

The despatches from the seat of war [illegible] to-day, while [illegible] to the location of the contending armies. The French line extends from Metz, a short distance to the northeastern boundary of France, at the junction with Germany and Prussia, [illegible] along the valley of the Moselle through Thionville, Metz, and Sarrebourg to Strasbourg on the Rhine. The Prussian forces appear to be only a few miles distant, following the line of the farce from Treves, through Merzig, Saar-Louis, Saarbrucken to Germelsheim, and thence to the Black Forest in Baden. A despatch from Berlin says that on Saturday morning the Prussians attacked Saarbrucken in largely superior force, but were vigorously repulsed. Saarbrucken is at the terminus of the railroad which runs through Treves, and the action at that place, however unimportant it may have been, indicates that it is the determination of the Prussian forces to permit no invasion of their territory at any point, but to push the conflict on the soil of the French line. French journals say that the Prussians have 700,000 men under arms, counting 190,000 in Schleswig and 80,000 in the city of Berlin. They add that the struggle between the Treves, Metzerz, and the river Lauter, is filled with soldiers. This triangle includes the fortress, or Rheinish Bavaria.

Further than this the movement of the masses of the Prussian forces is somewhat conjectural, but there can be no doubt that as much of army has been collected during the past two weeks. When Napoleon left Paris with his staff, it was the general expectation that he would march promptly across German frontier, and strike an important, if not decisive, blow before the Prussians were prepared; but the arrival of his forces at Metz and Thionville, they seem to have come to a sudden pause, and wherever they have crossed the frontier, they have run against something that will require time to overcome. The extreme circumspection with which the French movements have been conducted since they arrived within striking distance of the enemy has led to the belief, in England, that the next forward movement of the French forces will be in the direction of Paris. It is, of course, useless to speculate upon the fortunes of a war in which such tremendous forces are engaged, but enough is already known to answer to that the German forces have been taken by surprise, and that they are not unprepared for the encounter, and that Napoleon had ample justification for telling his people that the war which was forced upon him could not be hurriedly concluded, for its theatre will be places hedged with obstacles and thick with fortresses.

ENGLISH NEUTRALITY.

We are unable to understand the policy which has long caused the French against Great Britain for supplying France with large quantities of war. There is no principle of international law which is absolutely settled and more universally agreed to than that which allows the citizens of a neutral country to engage, at their own individual risk and profit, in the transportation of such international law recognizes itself with any distinction between articles contraband of war, and those which are not. Under our law the exportation of arms and munitions of war is forbidden, but the exportation of coal, provisions, or cotton, or any other article, is permitted. During our late civil war the exportation of arms to the Confederate States was not prohibited by our own statutes. The Confederates did the same, and no objection was made by either of the belligerents to the policy of their neutral neighbors. The only way to the other is an entirely different matter. Quite contraband of war are liable to seizure by the cruisers of either party, and, if captured, the ship fails upon the same principle. But, while the law is the highest authority upon this subject, Mr. Montague Bernard, Professor of International Law and Diplomacy in the University of Oxford, says: "If Prussia, if she be at war with France, cannot be prevented from getting [illegible] from England, she cannot, at Berlin, across the Prussian frontier; but if she gets them in England Prussia cannot stop them. She says force, on the high seas, whether over the Prussian or English flag. The English ship-owner runs the risk of that, and, if he be the owner of both ships and goods, he may lose his ship into the bargain." Mr. Bernard quotes, as if almost an exact analogy, the interference of the United States with the trade of Europe in Dahomian, 1854, which says: "The laws of the United States do not forbid their citizens to sell either of the belligerent powers any article of merchandise which they may think proper, or to lend money to either power, or to underwrite policies of insurance on board their private ships for the protection of their property against the risks of war, but they do not undertake to protect them in doing so. Other countries have adopted the same principle. The officers of the government of the United States have always declined to interfere with the trade of their citizens with either of the belligerent powers, and have left them to carry on that trade at their own risk."

It must be supposed that the course of Public opinion in France would not be one instant of the rules of international law as to suppose that it has been violated in the traffic between Great Britain and France, because the former has furnished ships of war to France, nor is any such complaint made. If, as Mr. Bernard says, the sale of a [illegible] to a belligerent is not a breach of neutrality, and it may be sold to either belligerent, although the [illegible] will not commit that breach again. It would seem, therefore, that some peculiar and improper influence must be exercised by the agents of France in England to induce the latter to forbid the [illegible] of the usual commerce in articles which are public to war.

Louis Napoleon seems not beginning to comprehend the extent of [illegible] he has [illegible]. In his proclamation to his army, on sending himself to join it, he says:

> "I go to assume command of the army which has been assembled around the frontier. In the present circumstances my presence among you is necessary. Full of confidence in the valor of the troops, I shall myself lead them against the enemy who insults the honor of the flag. I know that you will do your duty before the country, which follows your movements with anxiety. Remember that discipline is the first force of armies, and that it is the safeguard of victory. Let each one fulfill his duty, and Providence will favor our cause. Soldiers, I am going with you to share your fatigues and your dangers. For many of you it will be the battle of Kehl, of Strasbourg, of Alma, of Solferino. Let us show ourselves worthy of our fathers, and let the country be proud of its army."

Probably the last sentence is the most significant of the whole. It is evident that the Emperor is not sanguine of success, and that he is not willing to be held responsible for the result. He has left the conduct of the war to his generals, and he will not be blamed for their failure. He has gone to the front to encourage the troops, and to show that he is willing to share their fortunes, but he has not undertaken the responsibility of the campaign. He has left that to his generals, and they will be held responsible for the result.

THE SHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN QUESTION AND THE WAR.

A meeting of the Scandinavians of Chicago has been called by a number of the representative men of those nationalities, (Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish) to be held at Ulrich's Block, on Wednesday evening next, in order to consider the late war in Europe, as it may affect the countries of their nativity, and to express their opinions and sympathies in that behalf.

It is not to be supposed that any action which may be taken by such a meeting will be of a more public character than the war in Europe. Nevertheless, it may have some significance, as exhibiting the probable sympathies of the people of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden in the pending conflict. That the people of these countries are predisposed to take sides with Germany as against France, in a war undertaken by the latter without sufficient cause, there can be no doubt. But the recollection of the Schleswig-Holstein question of 1866, which led to the war between Austria and Prussia in 1866, complicates the question in their minds very seriously, and, although Sweden and Norway have no political connection with Denmark, and Sweden is not even bound to the latter by the tie of a common language, the three countries are likely to be governed by somewhat similar feeling in reference to the contest, and to their relations to the combatants.

As regards Schleswig-Holstein, the people of Schleswig, Holstein, and Lauenburg, formerly belonging to the Danish crown, as little better than robbery.

Since the present war has grown out of the acquisitions made by Prussia in 1866, and those acquisitions were the fruits of the Schleswig-Holstein affair of 1864, it is worth while to endeavor to understand what were the merits of that question, which has been so pregnant of disorders in European affairs. It has been irreverently said that these be any questions which the Almighty does not understand it is the Schleswig-Holstein question. And so it is, perhaps, if the solution is to be sought in the genealogies of the royal and ducal houses of Glucksburg and Augustenburg or in the numerous and contradictory treaties of European powers. Holstein and Lauenburg are, and always have been, in modern times, a part of Germany, although attached to the Danish crown, as Luxemburg and Limburg are attached to that of Holland. Schleswig is more properly a Danish province, although so largely Germanized as to be settled with Holsteins. Until 1864 against Danish rule, and asked admission to the Germanic Confederation. The two provinces were reconquered by Denmark, in 1849-50, and were held by the latter until 1865, when, upon the death of Frederick VII, King of Denmark, the Holstein Diet declared in favor of the Prince of Augustenburg as the rightful successor to the throne of Holstein, and asked the Germanic Confederation to recognize and defend its claims. The Diet at Frankfort, without committing itself to the Augustenburg dynasty, resolved to put an armed force into Holstein, which was done by the armies of Austria and Prussia. The Danes made a gallant but fruitless resistance. They were expelled from Holstein, and compelled to leave a portion of the latter province in charge of the forces of Austria and Lauenburg to Prussia and Austria. The Gastein Convention followed, by the terms of which Prussia took Schleswig, and Austria, Holstein, and Prussia and Austria became joint possessors of Lauenburg, for two and a half millions of dollars. Subsequently a portion of that Austria fulfilled the terms of the Gastein Convention, Prussia declared war against her, and by the victory of Sadowa compelled her, not only to cede Holstein, but to withdraw from Germany altogether.

It appears, therefore, that the Prussian claim to Schleswig is not based upon anything better than the law of the strongest.

Its acquisition was an act of robbery, and, although the southern half of the province is largely German in sympathy, it would probably have been refused to join the Germanic Confederation under the Duke of Augustenburg, the title which accompanied its forcible annexation from Denmark, as we will remember, to Austria at the commencement of the war of 1866. As to Holstein and Lauenburg, they were with Denmark when Frederick VII. died, and their connection, and, if the principle of German unity was ever to be carried into effect, they should probably have been forced by the other is an entirely different question. Quite contraband of war are liable to seizure by the cruisers of either party, and, if captured, the ship fails upon the same principle. But, while the law is the highest authority upon this subject, Mr. Montague Bernard, Professor of International Law and Diplomacy in the University of Oxford, says: "If Prussia, if she be at war with France, cannot be prevented from getting [illegible] from England, she cannot, at Berlin, across the Prussian frontier; but if she gets them in England Prussia cannot stop them. She says force, on the high seas, whether over the Prussian or English flag. The English ship-owner runs the risk of that, and, if he be the owner of both ships and goods, he may lose his ship into the bargain." Mr. Bernard quotes, as if almost an exact analogy, the interference of the United States with the trade of Europe in Dahomian, 1854, which says: "The laws of the United States do not forbid their citizens to sell either of the belligerent powers any article of merchandise which they may think proper, or to lend money to either power, or to underwrite policies of insurance on board their private ships for the protection of their property against the risks of war, but they do not undertake to protect them in doing so. Other countries have adopted the same principle. The officers of the government of the United States have always declined to interfere with the trade of their citizens with either of the belligerent powers, and have left them to carry on that trade at their own risk."

It must be supposed that the course of Public opinion in France would not be one instant of the rules of international law as to suppose that it has been violated in the traffic between Great Britain and France, because the former has furnished ships of war to France, nor is any such complaint made. If, as Mr. Bernard says, the sale of a [illegible] to a belligerent is not a breach of neutrality, and it may be sold to either belligerent, although the [illegible] will not commit that breach again. It would seem, therefore, that some peculiar and improper influence must be exercised by the agents of France in England to induce the latter to forbid the [illegible] of the usual commerce in articles which are public to war.

Louis Napoleon seems not beginning to comprehend the extent of [illegible] he has [illegible]. In his proclamation to his army, on sending himself to join it, he says:

> "I go to assume command of the army which has been assembled around the frontier. In the present circumstances my presence among you is necessary. Full of confidence in the valor of the troops, I shall myself lead them against the enemy who insults the honor of the flag. I know that you will do your duty before the country, which follows your movements with anxiety. Remember that discipline is the first force of armies, and that it is the safeguard of victory. Let each one fulfill his duty, and Providence will favor our cause. Soldiers, I am going with you to share your fatigues and your dangers. For many of you it will be the battle of Kehl, of Strasbourg, of Alma, of Solferino. Let us show ourselves worthy of our fathers, and let the country be proud of its army."

Probably the last sentence is the most significant of the whole. It is evident that the Emperor is not sanguine of success, and that he is not willing to be held responsible for the result. He has left the conduct of the war to his generals, and he will not be blamed for their failure. He has gone to the front to encourage the troops, and to show that he is willing to share their fortunes, but he has not undertaken the responsibility of the campaign. He has left that to his generals, and they will be held responsible for the result.

THE SHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN QUESTION AND THE WAR.

A meeting of the Scandinavians of Chicago has been called by a number of the representative men of those nationalities, (Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish) to be held at Ulrich's Block, on Wednesday evening next, in order to consider the late war in Europe, as it may affect the countries of their nativity, and to express their opinions and sympathies in that behalf.

It is not to be supposed that any action which may be taken by such a meeting will be of a more public character than the war in Europe. Nevertheless, it may have some significance, as exhibiting the probable sympathies of the people of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden in the pending conflict. That the people of these countries are predisposed to take sides with Germany as against France, in a war undertaken by the latter without sufficient cause, there can be no doubt. But the recollection of the Schleswig-Holstein question of 1866, which led to the war between Austria and Prussia in 1866, complicates the question in their minds very seriously, and, although Sweden and Norway have no political connection with Denmark, and Sweden is not even bound to the latter by the tie of a common language, the three countries are likely to be governed by somewhat similar feeling in reference to the contest, and to their relations to the combatants.

As regards Schleswig-Holstein, the people of Schleswig, Holstein, and Lauenburg, formerly belonging to the Danish crown, as little better than robbery.

Since the present war has grown out of the acquisitions made by Prussia in 1866, and those acquisitions were the fruits of the Schleswig-Holstein affair of 1864, it is worth while to endeavor to understand what were the merits of that question, which has been so pregnant of disorders in European affairs. It has been irreverently said that these be any questions which the Almighty does not understand it is the Schleswig-Holstein question. And so it is, perhaps, if the solution is to be sought in the genealogies of the royal and ducal houses of Glucksburg and Augustenburg or in the numerous and contradictory treaties of European powers. Holstein and Lauenburg are, and always have been, in modern times, a part of Germany, although attached to the Danish crown, as Luxemburg and Limburg are attached to that of Holland. Schleswig is more properly a Danish province, although so largely Germanized as to be settled with Holsteins. Until 1864 against Danish rule, and asked admission to the Germanic Confederation. The two provinces were reconquered by Denmark, in 1849-50, and were held by the latter until 1865, when, upon the death of Frederick VII, King of Denmark, the Holstein Diet declared in favor of the Prince of Augustenburg as the rightful successor to the throne of Holstein, and asked the Germanic Confederation to recognize and defend its claims. The Diet at Frankfort, without committing itself to the Augustenburg dynasty, resolved to put an armed force into Holstein, which was done by the armies of Austria and Prussia. The Danes made a gallant but fruitless resistance. They were expelled from Holstein, and compelled to leave a portion of the latter province in charge of the forces of Austria and Lauenburg to Prussia and Austria. The Gastein Convention followed, by the terms of which Prussia took Schleswig, and Austria, Holstein, and Prussia and Austria became joint possessors of Lauenburg, for two and a half millions of dollars. Subsequently a portion of that Austria fulfilled the terms of the Gastein Convention, Prussia declared war against her, and by the victory of Sadowa compelled her, not only to cede Holstein, but to withdraw from Germany altogether.

It appears, therefore, that the Prussian claim to Schleswig is not based upon anything better than the law of the strongest.

Its acquisition was an act of robbery, and, although the southern half of the province is largely German in sympathy, it would probably have been refused to join the Germanic Confederation under the Duke of Augustenburg, the title which accompanied its forcible annexation from Denmark, as we will remember, to Austria at the commencement of the war of 1866. As to Holstein and Lauenburg, they were with Denmark when Frederick VII. died, and their connection, and, if the principle of German unity was ever to be carried into effect, they should probably have been forced by the other is an entirely different question. Quite contraband of war are liable to seizure by the cruisers of either party, and, if captured, the ship fails upon the same principle. But, while the law is the highest authority upon this subject, Mr. Montague Bernard, Professor of International Law and Diplomacy in the University of Oxford, says: "If Prussia, if she be at war with France, cannot be prevented from getting [illegible] from England, she cannot, at Berlin, across the Prussian frontier; but if she gets them in England Prussia cannot stop them. She says force, on the high seas, whether over the Prussian or English flag. The English ship-owner runs the risk of that, and, if he be the owner of both ships and goods, he may lose his ship into the bargain." Mr. Bernard quotes, as if almost an exact analogy, the interference of the United States with the trade of Europe in Dahomian, 1854, which says: "The laws of the United States do not forbid their citizens to sell either of the belligerent powers any article of merchandise which they may think proper, or to lend money to either power, or to underwrite policies of insurance on board their private ships for the protection of their property against the risks of war, but they do not undertake to protect them in doing so. Other countries have adopted the same principle. The officers of the government of the United States have always declined to interfere with the trade of their citizens with either of the belligerent powers, and have left them to carry on that trade at their own risk."

It must be supposed that the course of Public opinion in France would not be one instant of the rules of international law as to suppose that it has been violated in the traffic between Great Britain and France, because the former has furnished ships of war to France, nor is any such complaint made. If, as Mr. Bernard says, the sale of a [illegible] to a belligerent is not a breach of neutrality, and it may be sold to either belligerent, although the [illegible] will not commit that breach again. It would seem, therefore, that some peculiar and improper influence must be exercised by the agents of France in England to induce the latter to forbid the [illegible] of the usual commerce in articles which are public to war.

Louis Napoleon seems not beginning to comprehend the extent of [illegible] he has [illegible]. In his proclamation to his army, on sending himself to join it, he says:

> "I go to assume command of the army which has been assembled around the frontier. In the present circumstances my presence among you is necessary. Full of confidence in the valor of the troops, I shall myself lead them against the enemy who insults the honor of the flag. I know that you will do your duty before the country, which follows your movements with anxiety. Remember that discipline is the first force of armies, and that it is the safeguard of victory. Let each one fulfill his duty, and Providence will favor our cause. Soldiers, I am going with you to share your fatigues and your dangers. For many of you it will be the battle of Kehl, of Strasbourg, of Alma, of Solferino. Let us show ourselves worthy of our fathers, and let the country be proud of its army."

Probably the last sentence is the most significant of the whole. It is evident that the Emperor is not sanguine of success, and that he is not willing to be held responsible for the result. He has left the conduct of the war to his generals, and he will not be blamed for their failure. He has gone to the front to encourage the troops, and to show that he is willing to share their fortunes, but he has not undertaken the responsibility of the campaign. He has left that to his generals, and they will be held responsible for the result.

THE RAILROAD DEBTS IN MICHIGAN.

Constitutional amendments have been every year to the appropriate committees of the Legislature of Michigan which provide, in substance, that

1. That all the bonds heretofore issued by counties, towns, and municipalities in aid of railroads shall be valid and binding upon the counties, towns, etc.

2. All the liquidations of the bonds issued and registered, but not yet delivered.

3. To authorize the issue of such bonds, for like purposes, in future.

The amendments to the fundamental law these persistent to the people of Michigan are of the most momentous character. They involve the question of repudiation of a debt of unknown proportions. In many cases the aid voted is a direct gratuity, a bounty to the railroad corporation, and without the payment of them debt-paying and subscriptions, the people are to be asked to [illegible] their credit and personal property for an indefinite period. These bonds bear an average interest of 8 per cent, and run twenty years. Assuming that they be delivered, these bonds but not yet delivered, and those authorized to be issued, to discharge the aggregate to $20,000,000, the people of Michigan are to be asked to assume the payment, within twenty years, as a donation to the railroad corporations, in the way of interest and principal, of $20,000,000, and every penny of this amount is to be collected by direct taxation. The average tax for that purpose will exceed $2,500,000 a year.

It is urged by those who demand the [illegible] of these amendments, that the bonds were [illegible] issued, and are in the hands of "innocent holders," and that it would be unjust [illegible] to pay them. This is the [illegible] of the case. The people [illegible] were [illegible] that the bonds would be paid, and [illegible] that they would be paid by taxation. [illegible] the

NEW YORK.

WASHINGTON.

ILLINOIS.

MICHIGAN.

MINNESOTA.

PACIFIC COAST.

TENNESSEE.

INDIANA.

THE GALLOWS.

MONETARY AND COMMERCIAL

MONETARY.

COMMERCIAL.

CHICAGO LUMBER MARKET.

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK MARKET.

CHICAGO DAILY MARKET.

MARRIED.

DIED.

SPECIAL NOTICES.

Dr. Bayley,

Dr. Franklin Brooks,

Dr. Raphael

Wanted and Wanderers.

Private Posters.

FINANCIAL.

HENRY H. BOODY & CO.,
BANKERS
AND
Railway Agents,
12 Wall-st., New York.

SCALES.

FORSYTH'S SCALES,
U. S. STANDARD,
Of all Sizes, with latest improvements. Examine and Buy the best.
FORSYTH, WILLIAMS & DOAL,
179 Lake-st., Chicago.
146 and 147 Water-st., Cincinnati.
208 and 209 Main-st., St. Louis.

FAIRBANKS
STANDARD
SCALES,
MACHINERY,
PORTABLE STEAM ENGINES,

OCEAN STEAMERS.

SUSPENDERS.
SAWYER & JUDS

CHARLES DICKENS.

Review of His Life and Death, by Rev. J. S. Felton, of Boston, at Farwell Hall, Yesterday Afternoon.

The Great Novelist's Noble Character—An Instruction that He Held of Value, and Did not Ape or Reverse.

He Is Held up as a Warning to the Rising Generation.

Rev. J. S. Felton, pastor of the Universal Church, Boston, delivered in Farwell Hall, yesterday afternoon, an address on Charles Dickens. The hall was filled to overflowing, and many were turned away by the janitors, and on the platform. After the usual custom of opening the exercises with prayer, and singing a hymn, Mr. Felton spoke as follows: "Many for his magnificence, others for his art, will be grateful to the late lamented Charles Dickens. But I am grateful to him for his truth. He was a great teacher of truth. He was a great preacher of righteousness. He was a great friend of God. He was a great friend of humanity. He was a great friend of the poor. He was a great friend of the oppressed. He was a great friend of the friendless. He was a great friend of the unfortunate. He was a great friend of the prisoner. He was a great friend of the drunkard. He was a great friend of the fallen. He was a great friend of the sinful. He was a great friend of the wicked. He was a great friend of the lost. He was a great friend of the dead. He was a great friend of the living. He was a great friend of God. He was a great friend of Christ. He was a great friend of the Holy Ghost. He was a great friend of the Holy Bible. He was a great friend of the Holy Book. He was a great friend of the Holy Word. He was a great friend of the Holy Gospel. He was a great friend of the Holy Spirit. He was a great friend of the Holy Ghost. He was a great friend of the Holy Trinity. He was a great friend of the Holy Father. He was a great friend of the Holy Son